

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/705,569

Applicant(s)

NORRIS, KAREN

Examiner

/Stephen J. Castellano/

Art Unit

3781

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) /Stephen J. Castellano/

(3) _____

(2) Mr. Leonard Belkin (appl. rep.)

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


Stephen Castellano
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed amendment filed August 24, 2007. Claim 1, part d), line 5, after "uninterruptedly" inserting "with no offset portions," was discussed and differentiates from Abrums (5799792) since Abrums has two indentations offset inwardly. Claim 1, part f), line 2, "limited to" was discussed as defining the color in a specific region to include the second lip but not the first lip which was different from Abrums since the language at col. 6, lines 8-9 "each lid 24 and matching container 22 may be molded of a same color plastic," would mean that the entire container base including both lips would be the same color.